



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

short of telegraphic. With this exception Mr. Lang has shown himself more than equal to the literary requirements of his task. Those who habitually thread the jungles of German historical literature will welcome with profound gratitude his delectable humor, his lightness of touch, and his never-failing wit.

GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY.

*The Gowrie Conspiracy and its Official Narrative.* By SAMUEL COWAN, J.P. (London : Sampson Low, Marston, and Company. 1902. Pp. x, 264.)

MR. COWAN'S arguments are invalidated by his own choice of material and its treatment. Nearly one-half of his book consists of what the author calls "reproductions," but which are really garbled condensations of official documents or secondary narratives. The former, with a few unimportant exceptions, are not printed from the originals in the archives, or from authoritative versions such as are given in Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials*. Mr. Cowan presents, apparently by choice, inaccurate renditions of loose copies.

The first "reproduction" is the "Narrative of James VI."—called by Mr. Cowan in the running head-line of the chapter and on the title-page of the book, "The Official Narrative." The appellation is erroneous and misleading. What Mr. Cowan reproduces is not the King's narrative at all; it is a garbled condensation of Tytler's narrative (Vol. IX. pp. 306–317, ed. 1843) of the events of August 5, based upon the Official Narrative properly so-called, Henderson's deposition, and various documents printed by Pitcairn. Apart from the misrepresentation of the nature of this fundamental document, Mr. Cowan is inaccurate in presentation of fact. One example must suffice for all. Tytler states—a point of capital importance—that Ruthven despatched Andrew Henderson to Gowrie from Falkland "instantly" "on the first *check*" in the hunting; Mr. Cowan (pp. 11–12) places the sending "during the ride" of James to Perth in Ruthven's company *after* the hunt.

Elsewhere Mr. Cowan reproduces the Sprot-Logan letters, using Tytler's incomplete versions as his basis. In all the letters he varies both from Tytler's and from more authoritative versions, altering the spelling and abbreviations, interpolating and omitting individual words, and changing words and punctuation so as to obscure the meaning. In Letter I. alone, by omitting portions summarized by Tytler, he at one stroke drops eighty-two words, at another forty-three, and at another ten. Now, by the publication of Mr. Lang's article in *Blackwood's* for April, 1902, the discussion of the authenticity of the Sprot-Logan letters entered upon a new phase, one important feature of which concerns orthography. Mr. Cowan asserts flatly (pp. 160, 183) that Mr. Lang's conclusions are erroneous. These reproductions place Mr. Cowan, as editor and critic, upon the horns of a dilemma: he cannot fairly contradict Mr. Lang unless he has scrutinized and compared originals: if he

has scrutinized originals, he has no excuse for reproducing the letters in such mutilated form.

It is from Hill Burton, and not from Calderwood or from the publications of the Bannatyne Club, that Mr. Cowan copies the conferences between James and the Reverend Robert Bruce, whom, although he was neither at Falkland nor at Perth, our author is pleased to dub (p. 148) "an eye-witness of the whole circumstances." One example suffices:

Burton: "'Think ye,' says the king, 'that Mr. David doubted of my report?' David was sent for incontinent."

Cowan: "'Think ye,' says the King, 'that Mr. David doubted my report?' 'No, David was sent from the Continent'" (p. 142).

Our author devotes eighty pages to the reproduction of four narratives read before the Perth Antiquarian Society in 1785. He commends them and accepts their conclusions. They are full of conjectural and provably incorrect statements, but have received no editing and are occasionally cited as primary authorities. In connection with James Logan's account of the Reverend Mr. Cowper's conversation with Gowrie, Mr. Cowan commits his most remarkable blunder. Logan, after repeating Gowrie's remark, as quoted by Cowper, to the effect that a conspirator against a prince "should not confide the secret to anyone," adds appositely "—a prudent remark . . . very consistent with the counterpart of the tragedy in which, so far from adhering to secrecy, he is represented as actually in correspondence until 31st July with Sir Robert Logan" [of Restalrig]. Mr. Cowan argues as follows: "In connection with the Logan Letters it is important to notice the statement (*sic*) made by Coupar in James Logan's paper. We would infer that Coupar was aware of the existence of these forged letters or he would not refer to the correspondence with Robert Logan up to 31st July. Whether Coupar was an accomplice with Sprot in this forgery is another question: all we can say is that his tale as reproduced by James Logan places him in a very compromising position."—This is astounding.

It is difficult to say which should be more severely condemned—Mr. Cowan's choice of material or his method of treatment. He never cites or uses a primary authority where a secondary is available. He produces little or nothing which is new; and it is hardly too much to say that wherever he is original, he is wrong. It is not important to state it—but Mr. Cowan believes in the guilt of the King.

OLIVER H. RICHARDSON.

*The Reign of Queen Anne.* By JUSTIN McCARTHY. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1902. Two vols., pp. v, 386; iv, 370.)

THE appearance of a history of the reign of Queen Anne by Justin McCarthy will doubtless waken pleasurable anticipations in various sections of the reading world. A lifetime spent in letters and politics would certainly seem the best of all possible methods of preparation for unraveling the bril-